DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 187 HE 015 723

AUTHOR	Stoyanoff, Karen S.
TITLE	Recognizing and Credentialing CETA Training. Higher Education/CETA Project Monograph.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jul 82
NOTE	8p.; For related documents, see HE 015 695-703.
AVAILABLE FROM	Higher Education/CETA Project, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Apprenticeships; College Role; *Credits; *Educational Certificates; Education Work Relationship; *Employment Potential; Employment Programs; Employment Qualifications; Experiential Learning; Federal Programs; Higher Education; Industry; *Job Training; Proprietary Schools; School Business Relationship; Standards; Student Certification; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Higher Education CETA Project

ABSTRACT

The problem of determining whether to award credit for training offered through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program and what credentials to offer is addressed as part of the American Council on Education's Higher Education/CETA Project, which was supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. In addition to the option of awarding academic or nonacademic credit, some training programs lead to a licensing exam, or provide preparation for a General Education Diploma. A certificate of completion may be awarded to indicate that the individual has studied and mastered a body of content, such as auto mechanics or English, for a given length of time. There are also programs such as apprenticeships and proprietary school training. Most of the studies relating to the credentializing of CETA training indicate that a credential for training or education is generally considered valuable, particularly for employment. In some instances, it is the credential, not the training or skills, that determines employment. In the case of the participants, the awarding of credit is seen by some CETA staff as a possible motivator and source of self-esteem. Many employers feel that academic credit for training indicates some qualities important to successful employment, including dependability and staying with a project until completion. Generally, academic credit seems to be most valuable if it leads to a degree or diploma. The problem of establishing credit for training offered by community-based organizations and other barriers to awarding academic credit are reviewed, along with examples of successful credit-awarding programs. It is noted that a record of credentials may be important in 5 or 10 years for verification of the CETA participant's training. (SW)

ED223187

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

A Monograph of the Higher Education/CETA Project

Joel D. Lapin, Director, Higher Education/CETA Project — July 1982

RECOGNIZING AND CREDENTIALING CETA TRAINING

By Karen S. Stoyanoff

INTRODUCTION

The linkage between the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and higher education institutions has been firmly established since the CETA program's inception in 1973. One major issue surrounding the relationship between CETA and these other institutions has always been awarding credit for CETA training. While awarding credit for training is accepted by many educators, it is not by any means an automatic part of CETA training. No uniform pattern of response to the issue exists; consequently a discussion of issues, practices, and procedures must present a varied picture to accurately reflect the diversity.

The problem of determining whether to award credit for CETA training and, if so, what credentials to offer, revolves around two issues. The first is, what are the purposes of recommending credit for training; and the second, how can credentialing be accomplished, or, in effect, what is the extent to which cooperating institutions can and will offer meaningful credentials. This monograph will address both these issues, and present cases of successful training programs that bear credit and credentials. Credentialing refers to the permanent record certifying that a student has completed a certain set of training activities. Academic credit, offered for courses of education or training, is the basic unit offered by colleges and universities. When a sequence of courses has been successfully completed, a degree, diploma, or certificate may be awarded.

Two types of credit will be considered: (1) Academic, or credit offered for courses leading to a degree and formally regulated by standards relating to duration of courses, background of instructor, and complexity of content; and (2) Non-academic, such as career credit, general studies, continuing education units, and several other categories developed by institutions that award credit. In general, non-academic credit cannot be used toward a degree or certificate program. Usually it does not transfer to another educational institution. A difference of opinion exists as to whether non-transferable credit is worth having, with the proponents stating that non-academic credit is valuable, providing it has definition and standards, and the opponents claiming that it has no meaning and therefore is counterfeit currency. Institutions which offer career or general studies, which are non-academic, believe such credit serves as a motivator and a reward for the participant, and is valuable as an indicator to the employer that the participant has completed a course of training. The concern of those opposed to the use of non-academic credit is that it will dilute the value of academic credit, and confuse both the participant and the employer as to its meaning and value. Regardless, non-academic credit is a visible means of recognizing training and is used by CETA training programs throughout the country.

In addition to the awarding of credit, there are other means of recognizing CETA training by CETA prime sponsors and educational institutions. Some training programs, such as cosmetology or barbering, lead to a licensing exam; others, such as preparation for a GED, lead to an academic exam. Usually the schools offering this training do not offer academic or non-academic credit, but will certify the participants' attendance at the training. In other instances, a certificate of completion is awarded which indicates that the individual has studied, practiced, and successfully mastered a body of content, such as auto mechanics, English, or work readiness, for a given length of time. In some cases the certificate of completion is competency based, and indicates that the par-

HE 015 723

ticipant has attained a certain level of competence at some job related skill, such as typing 60 words per minute, or performing specified types of welding. When this certificate is reasonably current, it provides a viable credential to present to the potential employer. However, when significant time has elapsed since the awarding of the certificate, an employer may not be willing to accept the competencies certified on it.

There are also programs such as apprenticeships, which have their own credentialing mechanisms, and proprietary schools, which have determined a course of study with or without a form of academic credit attached. One thing that is particularly important is that the record of all credentials be accessible in the future, so that five, ten, or even twenty years from now trainees will be able to offer verification that they have been trained. In higher education institutions this is done through a transcript indicating credit, degrees, and certification. For occupations requiring a license, the state maintains a formal record. A problem with some proprietary schools and community based organizations (CBO's) that provide training for CETA participants is that they do not have a mechanism for permanently recording any credential they offer. While the organization exists, if credentials are presented for the completion of training programs, it may be possible to resurrect a record of the certificate. However, often the organization no longer exists years later, and the record of training has ceased to exist with the organization. In many instances the CETA program staff have determined that the proprietary school or the CBO is the best deliverer of the training—for example, for English as a Second Language (ESL) training, or specific skill training such as computer repair and maintenance. In these instances, establishing a linkage between the delivery of training and a higher education institution eligible to give and record credit may solve the problem of credentialing the training appropriately.

It is not the purpose of this monograph to present the "correct" way to recognize and credential CETA training, but rather to describe the situation that exists regarding these issues. However, the monograph deals with programs that are using credit and credentials successfully. The successful use of both implies that they are of benefit to the CETA prime sponsor, the trainer, and the employer. In this sense the bias of this paper is in favor of attaching credit to the training CETA conducts, sub-contracts, or underwrites; but this does not mean that there is no value in training that does not bear credit. Many of those involved in training do not see value in credit and any discussion of the issue of credit and credentialing that purports to be an accurate presentation of what exists must make mention of this point of view.

Most of the studies relating to the credentialing of CETA training indicate that a credential for training or education is generally considered valuable, particularly for employment. In some instances employment cannot be obtained without the educational credential (GED, high school diploma, etc.) or license which is awarded upon successful completion of training (barber, LPN, RN, etc.). In these instances it is the *credential*, not the training or even the skill, which determines employment. This is one of the primary reasons that CETA regulations encourage the inclusion of academic credit in CETA training programs.

WHO OFFERS CREDIT

Ordinarily, academic credit is offered by educational institutions and agencies; however, basically any organization can recommend credit. The important qualification which usually affects the offering of credit is the accreditation of the organization. Recommendations from an unaccredited organization will be of little value, because it will not be recognized by other educational institutions, or, in some cases, employers. As a result, proprietary schools and community based organizations usually do not offer credit. Also for this reason, institutions that are accredited are very careful how they award credit. Accrediting agencies exist for two-year community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, and trade and technical schools. While these agencies do not establish arbitrary standards for the awarding of credit, they do evaluate the standards used by the institution they are evaluating. Usually credit is determined according to the number of hours spent in the classroom or laboratory, the quality of instruction, and the level and amount of content covered. Because accreditation seriously affects the schools' ability to attract and retain students, most institutions are very careful about the standards they establish for academic credit. Frequently the reason that a CETA training program is not offered for academic credit is that the training does not meet the standards set by the institution or statewide governing agency for academic credit.

There are fewer problems with non-academic or non-transfer credit, since the accreditation of the institution is not usually affected by non-academic or non-degree program courses. For this reason, where questions about the standards or content of the training exist, continuing education units (CEU's), career credit, or a certificate of completion are frequently used. If the training program is of a limited nature, this may be quite adequate. However, where a more extensive credential, such as a degree, diploma, or license, would be valuable, such training serves only an immediate need and does not motivate CETA participants to anything beyond the initial short-term training, which usually prepares them only for entry level positions. If at a later date they do choose to prepare for a higher level job that leads to a degree or diploma, they frequently have to repeat the initial training to obtain credit for it. This duplication of training is deplored both for its wastefulness and because it acts as a disincentive for CETA participants to pursue further education.

THE IMPACT OF CREDIT AND CREDENTIALING

The question of the purpose, of awarding credit and issuing credentials is a complex one, involving some disagreement among CETA staff and educational personnel as to the impact on training. The potential impact of credit and credentialing is focused on two groups: the participants and the employers.

In the case of the participants, the awarding of credit is seen by some CETA staff as a possible motivator. Particularly in youth programs, credit is seen as a way to keep young people 16 to 21 in a program, and to entice them to continue in school until graduation. On the other hand, CETA staff who do not favor academic credit often express the view that CETA eligible youth don't care about credit—that it is too esoteric a concept to appeal to them, and it involves delayed and abstract gratification which isn't viewed as valuable. In these instances, money in the form of a stipend or a wage is considered much more effective as a motivator. Another valid motivator is a sense of accomplishment, which it is believed is fostered, not by receiving academic credit, but by completing a project (especially in hands-on vocational training). In programs where administrators hold these beliefs, credit is not considered necessary. For those who dropped out of high school prior to graduation, credit is viewed as valuable primarily if it applies to a GED or diploma. In many instances, drop-out youth are happy to have a GED and not interested in building up academic credits that will never lead to a degree or diploma. Some employers have indicated that they prefer a GED to a diploma, since an absolute reading and math level must be attained in order to qualify for a GED but is not guaranteed with a diploma. Because the GED makes them more employable, it is a motivator.

From another standpoint, academic credit has value to the CETA participant in enhancing the self-concept. Quite often CETA participants regard themselves as failures and may have been treated as such in the academic setting. When they participate in CETA training and earn credit they prove to themselves as well as others that they can succeed in an educational program. This new view of themselves may carry over to other areas, and lead to further achievement.

The second group to be considered in determining the value of academic credit is the employer. Academic credit can be used as an indicator that the person applying for the job has been exposed to and mastered certain material, as in the case of credit for work experience, career education, job readiness, or vocational training. Other kinds of credentials, such as competency based certificates, licenses, or diplomas, may be very effective in helping the employer accurately assess what potential an applicant may have to succeed in any given job. The bottom line for some employers is dependability, punctuality, and willingness to stay with a project until completion. Many employers feel that academic credit for training indicates some of these qualities. For example, efforts have been made to quantify and increase good work attitudes by a 17 county consortium in Central Illinois. The consortium, made up of CETA prime sponsors, private industry councils, and educational service regions, established training schools to teach the desired attitudes, but found that measurement at the end of training showed no significant gains. Whether this was due to inappropriate measures, ineffective training, a general inability to teach values, or any combination of these factors is not known. However, the goal of establishing a competency-based work readiness attitude certification has not yet succeeded in this location.

Employers who have been questioned indicated that what academic credit means to them is that the recipient has demonstrated his or her ability to accept direction from authority, attend classes regularly and punctually, and stay with a project to completion. Whether or not receiving credit for a course of training actually certifies these behaviors is something that the higher education community might want to debate, but for some employers, at least, academic credit is as good an indicator of "work readiness" as any available. Clearly, as mentioned, there are some jobs where credit or a credential makes a big difference to the employer, and in others the credential adds greatly to the candidate's chances of being hired. A person with an Associate of Science degree in computer programming or a certificate in computer technology may be employable, while someone without these credentials cannot get a job in the field.

In many cases the critical credential may not be the academic credit itself, but the degree or certificate it leads up to. An individual with three credits in computer programming or nursing may not be any more employable than someone with no credits. Furthermore, there are many entry level jobs where a diploma or degree is not relevant, and academic credit for that training is not important. An auto-mechanic needs to know how to fix cars; academic credit for physics or math is not as valuable as a non-academic credit or certificate in auto shop. For this reason, it is not *necessary* that all CETA training result in credit, even though credit may always enhance the training in the eyes of some students.

ISSUES IN SELECTING THE APPROPRIATE CREDENTIAL

Generally, academic credit seems to be most valuable if it leads to a degree or diploma. Neither the participants nor the employers are very interested in academic credit by itself. In instances where the training is not so extensive as to warrant a degree or does not apply to a diploma, some other credential such as a CEU or certificate of completion may be more valuable. It is important that the credential chosen be appropriate to the training. There is no magic in academic credit. A competency-based certificate that clearly indicates the skill level of a potential secretary may be much more impressive to a future employer than a transcript listing nine credits in general secretarial courses. There is a strong case to be made for some kind of credential accompanying CETA training, both as a motivator for the participant and a verification of skill and knowledge level for the potential employer; however, the specific credential chosen needs to match both the training institution and the training itself.

In addition to specific training programs that equip a CETA participant to be employed in a certain job, as discussed above, there are programs designed to help those who do not have the basic skills necessary to participate successfully in occupational job training. These programs may consist of remedial work in reading and math, or preparation for GED. Although these programs are frequently run by colleges and universities and other postsecondary educational institutions, their content

level is usually not sufficient for academic credit, nor do they apply to a degree offered by the institution. For this reason, these training programs quite often do not involve any kind of credit or credential. If the participants improve their basic skill level enough to pass the GED test or qualify for other job training programs, that fact is more important to their ultimate employability than any kind of credit could possibly be. This is particularly true in areas, such as university towns, where the educational level of the population is so high that almost all jobs, even those at entry level and unskilled, require a high school diploma or GED.

A wide variety of training options is used by CETA prime sponsors throughout the United States. In some cases students enter on-going programs of study toward a degree or certificate at an area vocational center, community college, or proprietary school. In these cases academic credit is awarded as it would be with any student, and credit earned is applicable to a degree, diploma or certificate. In other instances, CETA participants become part of an already established work experience or vocational training program; and here, too, whatever credit normally accrues to the program is automatically awarded to CETA participants.

The area of work experience, including on-the-job training, is a difficult one to deal with, since many educational institutions do not regularly offer credit for work experience. However, there is precedent for offering credit for experiential education, such as internships and field education, and some CETA prime sponsors have established credit bearing work experience programs. The question of openness to non-traditional education applies to the entire institution, and their attitude toward accrediting CETA training programs may be reflective of a general stance relating to experiential education.

A third area of training for CETA includes class size training programs that are run by colleges and universities and other educational agencies strictly for CETA participants. Here the practices are variable, because policies for establishing credit for new courses vary from one institution to another. There is no hard and fast rule about the offering of credit for these programs. In organizations that are generally positively disposed to CETA itself, and to other forms of non-traditional education, quite often these programs are operated with academic or non-academic credit. In other instances, where the institution is not particularly interested in helping the problem learner, or where there is a general antipathy toward CETA, the programs may well be operated without credit. This situation is not to be confused with instances where the organization is extremely concerned about meeting standards for accreditation, or where the content level or length of the training is not adequate for academic credit.

A fourth major category of CETA training, as mentioned above, is that of remedial work. One of the most significant needs of many CETA participants is to raise their basic skill level, improve their command of English (particularly where English is a second language), and brush up on their job skills. In this area, CETA prime sponsors and colleges and universities have established training programs in ABE (Adult Basic Education), pre-GED, ESL (English as a Second Language), and brush-up courses for up-grading secretarial and other skill areas. Most of these courses do not meet the standards and guidelines for academic credit in the institutions which provide the training, and so are offered with a non-academic credit or a certificate.

Proprietary schools, such as cosmetology schools, truck driver training schools, and computer operator schools, often do not offer credit, particularly academic credit. Their expectation is that a student will complete units of study in a prescribed sequence, or work at the school until they demonstrate a certain level of competence, after which they will receive a diploma or certificate or take an examination for licensing. It is not their expectation that a student will use the training they have provided in a course of study at any other institution; therefore they have no need to establish a credit system in relation to their program. In this regard, they may limit the CETA student who would like to work toward an Associate of Arts degree, an RN, or some other credential. If there is not transferability, the time spent at the proprietary school cannot be counted toward a degree at a community college or any other institution, and may be a discouragement to the CETA participant's continuing education. These schools differ from private vocational colleges, which usually offer a greater variety of vocational options and have patterned their program after traditional colleges with courses, credits, and degrees.

Although not widely used by CETA participants, apprenticeable occupation programs can be a source of training. The Bureau of Apprenticeship, which is part of the Department of Labor, sets standards for the training conducted in certain apprenticeship programs. In other programs, states set apprenticeship standards. A CETA participant qualifying for an apprenticeable occupation can enter an apprenticeship funded through CETA. The major drawback to this kind of training is that the waiting list for the most desirable apprenticeship programs is long, and there is only a slight chance that a CETA participant will be able to get in quickly. Since most CETA participants need assistance "now," and cannot wait a year or two until their number comes up, this option cannot be used frequently. However, a few years ago, the Dallas Community College District ran a successful CETA apprenticeship program for women in the building trades, perhaps because the building trades were then having difficulty meeting their equal employment opportunity requirements for apprenticing women and minorities. There are also pre-apprenticeship training programs in other areas of the country. In these programs, applicants who do not meet qualifications for entering apprenticeship programs are given CETA supported training to bring them up to entry level. In Oregon and Massachusetts CETA has agreements with building trade unions to recognize this training and apply some of the time spent as points toward the apprenticeship training itself. Strictly speaking, academic credit is not offered for apprentice training unless the training involves a course such as physics, math, or accounting taken at a traditional institution. However, an apprentice who drops out or switches to another apprenticeable occupation may receive "credit" for work done in the first program if it is also required in the second.

In addition, some CETA training activities are conducted by non-educational organizations such as Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC), the Migrant Council, Service Employment Redevelopment (SER), and the Urban League. In these cases, in order to receive academic credit, the organization must establish an agreement with some recognized educational institution such as a school district, community college, private college, or educational service region superintendent's office. Any credit offered by the organizations and not recognized by an educational institution would have very little value.

BARRIERS TO AWARDING ACADEMIC CREDIT

There are a variety of reasons why academic credit may not be offered for CETA training. Some of them have already been mentioned. Perhaps the most important is that some training may not seem to meet the standards for credit at any given institution. If it is determined that credit is essential for the training program, the length of the course or the qualifications of the trainers can be upgraded to meet the standards. However, quite often the complexity of the training cannot be changed and still meet the needs of the participants. Where this is true, the training and the participant must settle for some recognition other than academic credit.

Secondly, hostility on the part of those who control the awarding of credit, to CETA or the training program itself, may prevent the awarding of academic credit. Sometimes the individual who is opposed can be convinced that credit is appropriate or that CETA training is valuable, but this is a difficult task. From some CETA prime sponsors it has seemed better to do without academic credit for training programs than to risk further irritating administrators who are not particularly interested in CETA. It is evident from talking to both CETA and educational personnel that the single most important element in establishing effective training programs with or without credit is a good working relationshp between CETA personnel and educational personnel. Where this relationship is based upon mutual respect and frequent contact, new and innovative CETA training programs are frequently devised.

One of the major factors influencing the choice of credit for CETA training is the attitude of those designing and presenting the program. In places where educators and CETA personnel are convinced that academic credit is an important recognition for a CETA participant, the training is far more apt to bear credit than in places where the personnel involved see the goal of CETA training programs as immediate employment. In the latter case, not only is academic credit rarely offered, but any educational recognition is also viewed as unimportant.

Sometimes CETA training does not offer credit because CETA personnel did not ask for credit in designing the program. Where credit is seen as a viable part of the participant's self concept and motivation and of the employers' decision making process, a serious effort is made to attach credit to the training. In some cases where academic credit is not deemed important, some other method is valued, such as a competency based certificate. Quite often higher value is placed on GED or high school completion programs, or on training programs that lead to licensing, such as LPN or cosmetology. Because the employability of the person with these credentials is so much greater, the credential is highly valued.

The practice of offering credit for experiential learning has already been mentioned. With it also, there can be barriers to the establishment of credit for CETA training activities. Usually, where the experiential learning is sponsored and supervised by an educational institution, there is less trouble with establishing credit for such programs than when CETA or a non-educational organization conducts and supervises the training. Of course, arranging for credit in this area is easier in institutions where a commitment has already been made to experiential learning. Since so much of CETA training involves hands-on training and on-the-job experience, this experiential aspect is necessarily a major issue in the accrediting of CETA training. Closely allied is the issue of credit for prior learning, which may be a valuable tool for the CETA program operator but is not always an acceptable option for the educational institution.

There are several barriers to establishing credit that result from CETA regulations and practices. For instance, CETA support of participants in training programs is limited in length by federal regulation. In instances where the one-hundred-and-four-week limit for CETA support of training is imposed, some participants never receive credit for their training, because all or the majority of the time is used up in remedial work that is not eligible for academic credit. In addition to not receiving credit, many of these participants do not have time to achieve a level of skills that makes them employable. Also, the CETA regulations specify who is eligible, and frequently this prevents CETA from involving participants in credit bearing programs. This is not meant to say that the "most needy" should not be served first by CETA, but in terms of establishing academic credit for CETA training, the nature of the population being served may well provide a significant barrier.

Finally, there is the problem of establishing credit for training that is provided by community based organizations and other non-academic training institutions. Where good linkages exist between the local CETA prime sponsor and the educational institutions credit agreements can sometimes be established. In some jurisdictions, the CETA prime sponsor sub-contracts with the area junior or community college to establish training programs as needed. Where this occurs, the college goes to the CBO to establish the training program and quite often sets up arrangements for academic or non-academic credit through their own organization. It must be noted that sometimes the community based organization, such as OIC, SER, the Migrant Council, or the Urban League, is the best qualified agency to actually provide the training needed, even though they cannot by themselves offer credit for the training. The training provided by CBO's has great value with or without recognition because of

the positive relationship between the CBO and the CETA participant; however, establishing credit for the training increases its value.

While many community colleges and other two-year postsecondary institutions throughout the United States have established CETA training programs with credit, fewer four-year colleges and universities have become involved with CETA training. Quite often, those that do work with CETA do so out of a continuing education or vocational education division rather than an academic department. The University of Wisconsin does have sponsored work-experience programs at almost all of its campuses; however, the connection with CETA is just beginning to be established through a linkage project funded by the Governor's Employment and Training Office in the Office of Educational Research and Development, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

Throughout the United States there are CETA prime sponsors who have established appropriate credit and credentials for their training programs. A few examples are cited here to indicate the breadth of possibilities for training. The term "successful" in this instance refers not to the quality of the training, but to the establishment of credit for the training. None of the sites described here had hard data on the impact of the credit on the trainees or their employment prospects, but they all believed that having appropriate credit attached to the training is important enough to warrant the time and effort it takes to establish them.

At the State University of New York-Oswego, CETA eligible youth were involved in a semester-long intensive remedial program in basic skills. At the same time they took a credit bearing Career Exploration course and one elective. After this first semester, the participants were employed full time, and took Career Awareness, a credit bearing course. Finally, the students were enrolled in a typical freshman academic program for the third semester. The office of experience-based education reports that ten out of twelve participants stayed in postsecondary education at the close of this experience.

At Georgia State University in Atlanta, Project EXCEL in the College of Urban Life (now the College of Public and Urban Affairs), allows CETA participants to take 30 quarter hours of credit in urban life courses. The purpose of the program is to link work experience with academic course work. Students establish a learning contract with an instructor which delineates learning goals, activities, and experiences designed to achieve these objectives, and an evaluation method. The college supervises this work experience and provides guidance for the student. Students who complete the program are awarded an Associate of Science degree.

Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, Illinois, offers CETA participants the opportunity to pursue careers by developing skills in such areas as auto body, welding, medical/clerical, machine tool technology, and heating and air conditioning. Students attend class for 24 weeks, 40 hours per week. Upon completion of the program, which is offered in the School of Technical Careers, the student receives a certificate which lists the hours of instruction and skills that have been mastered.

At the community college level a great deal of activity is taking place. Because community colleges have a mission to provide vocational and career education, adult continuing education, and community service, they are frequently the most logical provider of CETA training. In most CETA regions, the linkage between community colleges and the CETA prime sponsor has been firmly established since the inception of the CETA program. In many instances the community college has a representative on the CETA advisory board, and regular communications exist. However, this does not always lead to the establishment of academic credit for CETA training. In Illinois, which has a highly developed community college system, the Illinois Community College Board reviews all proposed credit courses for approval before academic credit can be offered. The process can be time consuming, and frequently it is easier to establish CEU's or non-transfer credit for class-size CETA training programs. Of course, where CETA participants enter already established two-year degree training programs or one-year certification programs, credit is given to the CETA students. In several cases, CETA has established a program at the area community college that includes counseling and tutoring for CETA participants who need extra help. Sometimes, as is true at Lewis and Clark Community College in Godfrey, Illinois, CETA participants attend classes that are similar to those in the regular accounting and data entry programs, but that operate 30 hours per week for one semester (data entry), or one year (accounting), and are just for CETA students. These students receive regular academic credit for accounting, business communication, data processing, and business law. For other classes in this course of study, they receive non-transferable credit. At the close of the program, they are awarded a certificate.

At the College of Lake County in Grayslake, Illinois, and the Dallas Community College District in Dallas, Texas, the colleges are recipients of large grants from the local CETA prime sponsor, and act as brokers to establish training for CETA participants through their own educational system and other area organizations. This allows for consolidation of programming activities while still making use of a variety of community resources; and it facilitates the awarding of credit for training, since the umbrella agency is an educational agency qualified to grant a variety of credits.

The Utah Technical College, which is a two-year institution in Salt Lake City, has established programs for CETA participants in vocational training. Programs in such skill areas as auto mechanics, welding, building construction, general clerical, and truck driving last from four to six months. A competency-based certificate listing the area studied and class hours attended is awarded upon completion. Because the Skills Center Division, out of which the program operates, is not accredited, it

cannot offer academic credit. However, CETA students who have dropped out of high school can earn up to four elective credits and one math credit towards graduation from area high schools.

Some private schools have also established linkages with CETA prime sponsors. A good example of successful programming in this area is Robert Morris College in Carthage, Illinois. Robert Morris is an institution whose purpose is to provide career education for its students. It is accredited by the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools, and has operated programs with CETA students since 1976. Students participate in secretarial, accounting, medical assisting, dental assisting, and food service management. Program length varies from one semester to two years, and leads to a certificate of completion or an AA degree depending upon the area of specialization. Academic credit is given for courses completed at Robert Morris. The college has been active in seeking out relationships with CETA, and staff members report that the program has been successful for both the participants and the college.

For the most part, proprietry schools do not offer credit. A notable exception is Control Data Institute (CDI). Throughout the United States, they have CETA training programs. They are perhaps best known for their program of GED preparation using PLATO, but this is not a credit bearing program. The CDI in St. Louis, Missouri, in addition to having a GED program, serves six area prime sponsors in Missouri and Illinois with computer programming and technology training. Their training program lasts 27 weeks, and offers a certificate of completion rather than academic credit; but Control Data has established transfer arrangements with several area colleges to accept credit for work done at CDI in computer classes if a student wishes to pursue an AA degree or baccalaureate. This is a significant achievement, since it serves to offer the participant an incentive to continue training beyond entry level in the field.

SUMMARY

Clearly, the linkage between CETA and higher education institutions is widespread. The precedent has been set to offer academic credit, non-academic credit, and credentials for both traditional classroom training and non-traditional experiential learning. There is no question but that it is possible to accredit a great deal of CETA training, but there is no set model that can be described as either typical or most appropriate, nor any one credential which meets all training needs. As a result, a concise summary statement about this issue is not possible; nor is it particularly desirable, since one of the strengths of our education and training systems is their variety, and this necessitates diversity in allied areas such as credit and credentialing. While it might be an advantage to a discussion of credit and credentialing to have one model which could be applied anywhere, it is *not* a criticism of either CETA or the educational and training institutions they work with to say that no uniform practice exicts. The most accurate summary statement that can be made is that there is no standard operating procedure for awarding credit and for credentialing CETA training, and that the practice in any area will be determined by the attitude of the personnel at the CETA prime sponsor and the local educational institution, by the particular rules and regulations that apply to offering credit at those agencies, and by the established working experience of all involved.

The position of this author is that any form of credit is preferable to no credit, because there is the potential for positive impact upon the trainee and a future employer, and because any credential offers a permanent record of the training experience. It must be remembered that the awarding of credit is only one facet of training, and a negative reaction to credit (or lack of it) in any specific training situation should in no way be taken as an indictment of the training as a whole. This monograph deals with issues of credit and credentialing, and it is accurate to say that appropriately accredited training is generally preferred to training without credit. It is also appropriate to point out that many options exist for the CETA program operators who wish to establish credit for their training. The lack of standard practice is viewed as a strength. While there are distinct advantages to CETA training that bears credit or leads to some meaningful credential, it is also evident that much valuable training occurs without either. As long as CETA personnel and educators disagree as to the goal of training and the impact of credit upon the goal, these discrepancies in the practice of accrediting CETA training will exist.

Karen S. Stoyanoff, Ph.D.

Dr. Stoyanoff, who has a Ph.D. in educational administration from Northwestern University, is a past fellow in the Educational Policy Fellowship Program of the Institute of Educational Leadership, George Washington University.

Currently, Dr. Stoyanoff is conducting a research study on credit and credentialing of CETA training in Illinois for the College of Lake County, Grayslake, Illinois. She has been an evaluator of programs in administration, minority education, and education of the gifted at Central YMCA College, Chicago; a consortium of universities and colleges in the midwest; and area high schools. Since 1977 she has directed staff development programs for Illinois CETA prime sponsors, North Chicago VA Hospital, and the area Junior College Continuing Education Programs for Adults.

She has been a member of the Governor of Illinois' Task Force on School Reorganization and Chair of the Rockford Board of Education Advisory Committee on the twelve-month school year. She has done extensive training for both pre-service and in-service teachers in the areas of communication skills, general classroom strategies, and writing skills.

Since 1978, Dr. Stoyanoff has authored more than twenty-five papers and has participated in numerous workshops before professional groups with a focus on the work place.

The views expressed in this monograph are those of the author, not necessarily those of the American Council on Education.